

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
WEEKLY FILINGS
For the Period October 18, 2007 through October 24, 2007

Copies of these items may be found on the PUC website at <http://www.puc.sd.gov>

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

TC07-111 In the Matter of the Petition of Alliance Communications Cooperative, Inc. for Arbitration Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Resolve Issues Relating to an Interconnection Agreement with Alltel Communications, Inc.

On October 19, 2007, Alliance Communications Cooperative, Inc. (Alliance) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between Alliance and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. Alliance filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) Is the reciprocal compensation rate for IntraMTA Traffic proposed by Alliance appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (2) What is the appropriate Percent InterMTA Use factor to be applied to non-IntraMTA traffic exchanged between the parties?
- (3) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (4) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dial parity?
- (5) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

Alliance requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved Issues between Alliance and WWC;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing Alliance and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval an interconnection agreement reflecting:
 - (i) the agreed-upon language in Exhibit A, and
 - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by Alliance as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date set forth in Exhibit A) to the date on which the Commission approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act
- D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;
- E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the commission receives the petition.

Staff Analyst: Keith Senger
Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer
Date Filed: 10/19/07
Responses Due: 11/13/07

**TC07-112 In the Matter of the Petition of McCook Cooperative Telephone Company
for Arbitration Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Resolve
Issues Relating to an Interconnection Agreement with Alltel
Communications, Inc.**

On October 19, 2007, McCook Cooperative Telephone Company (McCook) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between McCook and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. McCook filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) Is the reciprocal compensation rate for IntraMTA Traffic proposed by McCook appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (2) What is the appropriate Percent InterMTA Use factor to be applied to non-IntraMTA traffic exchanged between the parties?
- (3) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (4) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dial parity?
- (5) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

McCook requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved Issues between McCook and WWC;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing McCook and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval an interconnection agreement reflecting:
 - (i) the agreed-upon language in Exhibit A, and
 - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by McCook as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date set forth in Exhibit A) to the date on which the Commission approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act
- D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;
- E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the commission receives the petition.

Staff Analyst: Keith Senger
Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer
Date Filed: 10/19/07
Responses Due: 11/13/07

TC07-113 In the Matter of the Petition of Beresford Municipal Telephone Company for Arbitration Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Resolve Issues Relating to an Interconnection Agreement with Alltel Communications, Inc.

On October 19, 2007, Beresford Municipal Telephone Company (Beresford) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between Beresford and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. Beresford filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) Is the reciprocal compensation rate for IntraMTA Traffic proposed by Beresford appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (2) What is the appropriate Percent InterMTA Use factor to be applied to non-IntraMTA traffic exchanged between the parties?
- (3) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (4) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dial parity?
- (5) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

Beresford requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved Issues between Beresford and WWC;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing Beresford and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval an interconnection agreement reflecting:
 - (i) the agreed-upon language in Exhibit A, and
 - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by Beresford as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date set forth in Exhibit A) to the date on which the Commission approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act
- D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;

- E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the commission receives the petition.

Staff Analyst: Keith Senger
Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer
Date Filed: 10/19/07
Responses Due: 11/13/07

TC07-114 In the Matter of the Petition of Kennebec Telephone Company for Arbitration Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Resolve Issues Relating to an Interconnection Agreement with Alltel Communications, Inc.

On October 19, 2007, Kennebec Telephone Company (Kennebec) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between Kennebec and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. Kennebec filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) Is the reciprocal compensation rate for IntraMTA Traffic proposed by Kennebec appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (2) What is the appropriate Percent InterMTA Use factor to be applied to non-IntraMTA traffic exchanged between the parties?
- (3) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (4) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dial parity?
- (5) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

Kennebec requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved Issues between Kennebec and WWC;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing Kennebec and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval an interconnection agreement reflecting:
 - (i) the agreed-upon language in Exhibit A, and
 - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by Kennebec as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date set forth in Exhibit A) to the date on which the Commission approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act

- D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;
- E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the commission receives the petition.

Staff Analyst: Keith Senger
Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer
Date Filed: 10/19/07
Responses Due: 11/13/07

TC07-115 In the Matter of the Petition of Santel Communications Cooperative, Inc. for Arbitration Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Resolve Issues Relating to an Interconnection Agreement with Alltel Communications, Inc.

On October 19, 2007, Santel Communications Cooperative, Inc. (Santel) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between Santel and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. Santel filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) Is the reciprocal compensation rate for IntraMTA Traffic proposed by Santel appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (2) What is the appropriate Percent InterMTA Use factor to be applied to non-IntraMTA traffic exchanged between the parties?
- (3) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (4) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dial parity?
- (5) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

Santel requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved Issues between Santel and WWC;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing Santel and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval an interconnection agreement reflecting:
 - (i) the agreed-upon language in Exhibit A, and
 - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by Santel as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date set forth in Exhibit A) to the date on which the Commission

- approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act
- D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;
 - E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

Staff Analyst: Keith Senger
Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer
Date Filed: 10/19/07
Responses Due: 11/13/07

TC07-116 In the Matter of the Petition of West River Cooperative Telephone Company for Arbitration Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Resolve Issues Relating to an Interconnection Agreement with Alltel Communications, Inc.

On October 19, 2007, West River Cooperative Telephone Company (West River) filed a petition for arbitration of certain unresolved terms and conditions of a proposed Interconnection Agreement between West River and Alltel Communications, Inc. (Alltel), pursuant to Section 252 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, SDCL 49-31-81, and ARSD 20:10:32:29. West River filed a list of unresolved issues consisting of:

- (1) Is the reciprocal compensation rate for IntraMTA Traffic proposed by West River appropriate pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252(d)(2)?
- (2) What is the appropriate Percent InterMTA Use factor to be applied to non-IntraMTA traffic exchanged between the parties?
- (3) What is the appropriate manner by which the minutes of use of IntraMTA Traffic terminated by the parties, one to the other, should be calculated and billed?
- (4) What is the obligation of the parties with respect to dial parity?
- (5) What is the appropriate effective date and term of the Agreement?

West River requests the following relief:

- A. Issuance of an Order requiring arbitration of any and all unresolved Issues between West River and WWC;
- B. Issuance of an Order directing West River and Alltel to submit to this Commission for approval an interconnection agreement reflecting:
 - (i) the agreed-upon language in Exhibit A, and
 - (ii) the resolution of any unresolved issues in accordance with the positions and recommendations made by West River as set forth herein at the arbitration hearing to be scheduled by this Commission
- C. Issuance of an Order directing the parties to pay interim compensation for transport and termination of telecommunications traffic from January 1, 2007 (the Effective Date set forth in Exhibit A) to the date on which the Commission approves the parties' executed interconnection agreement in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act

- D. Issuance of an Order asserting this Commission jurisdiction over this arbitration until the parties have submitted an executed interconnection agreement for approval by this Commission in accordance with Section 252(e) of the Act;
- E. Any other, further and different relief as the nature of this matter may require or as may be just, equitable and proper to this Commission.

In accordance with ARSD 20:10:32:30, a non-petitioning party may respond to the petition for arbitration and provide additional information within 25 days after the commission receives the petition.

Staff Analyst: Keith Senger
Staff Attorney: Karen Cremer
Date Filed: 10/19/07
Responses Due: 11/13/07

You may receive this listing and other PUC publications via our website or via internet e-mail.

You may subscribe or unsubscribe to the PUC mailing lists at <http://www.puc.sd.gov>